

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

GENNADY DOLZHENKO,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

VALLEY TEMPS, INC.,

Defendant and Respondent.

B233449

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. LC075992)

ORDER MODIFYING OPINION

(NO CHANGE IN JUDGMENT)

THE COURT*

We have received and reviewed appellant's petition for rehearing filed September 6, 2012.

It is ordered that the unpublished opinion filed August 22, 2012 be modified as follows:

1. On page 3, the last sentence in the first full paragraph is deleted.
2. On page 12, the first full paragraph, beginning "Two arguments are raised" is deleted and the following is inserted in its place:

3. *Expert Testimony*

Appellant argues that respondent's fee award had to be supported by expert opinion regarding the reasonable fee for the services provided. But "judges themselves are deemed to be experts on the value of legal services, and may rely on their own experience about reasonable and proper fees, without resort to expert testimony." (*Donahue v. Donahue* (2010) 182 Cal.App.4th 259, 276.) Appellant has not demonstrated a need for expert testimony in addition to the expertise of the trial court judge regarding a determination of the reasonable amount of fee to be awarded.

For the first time on appeal, appellant claims the fee order under review was rendered by a judge other than the trial judge. The judge who entered the orders granting fees affirmed in *Dolzhenko I* and *II* is not the judge who made the award we now review, and we infer this is the basis for this argument, although appellant presents no supporting authority. Arguments raised for the first time in a reply brief result in forfeiture of the argument and we therefore decline to consider these contentions. (*Martin v. PacifiCare of California* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 1390, 1410, fn. 12.) In addition, an argument not supported by citation to authority is forfeited. (*Nickell v Matlock* (2012) 206 Cal.App.4th 934, 947.)

This modification does not change the judgment.

*EPSTEIN, P. J.,

MANELLA, J.

SUZUKAWA, J.